Case 3:10-cv-00605 Document 287 Filed in TXSD on 07/31/15 Page 1 of 70 1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS 2 HOUSTON DIVISION 3 4 DAVID LIPNICKI, ET AL., Plaintiffs, 5 ) CIVIL ACTION NO. VS. ) 3:10-CV-605 6 MERITAGE HOMES 7 CORPORATION, ET AL., ) 9:25 A.M. TO 10:07 A.M. ) 10:24 A.M. TO 11:16 A.M. Defendants. 8 9 CLOSING ARGUMENTS OF COUNSEL DURING JURY TRIAL BEFORE THE HONORABLE GREGG COSTA 10 NOVEMBER 18, 2014 11 APPEARANCES: 12 FOR PLAINTIFFS: MS. RHONDA HUNTER WILLS, 13 MS. GENEVIEVE ESTRADA, AND 14 MR. ANTHONY WILLS Wills Law Firm, PLLC 1776 Yorktown, Suite 570 15 Houston, Texas 77056 16 (713)528-445517 MR. JOHN M. PADILLA, AND MR. J. MOISES CEDILLOS Padilla & Rodriguez, L.L.P. 18 1776 Yorktown, Suite 110 19 Houston, Texas 77056 (832)740-43012.0 FOR DEFENDANTS: 21 MR. SCOTT ROBERT MCLAUGHLIN, MS. MARLENE WILLIAMS, 22 MS. KATHERINE SILVER, AND MR. CHEVAZZ BROWN Jackson Walker LLP 23 1401 McKinney, Suite 1900 Houston, Texas 77010 2.4

(713)752-4200

Case 3:10-cv-00605 Document 287 Filed in TXSD on 07/31/15 Page 2 of 70 1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED: 2 ALSO PRESENT: MR. DAVID LIPNICKI 3 MS. DONNA ARMSTRONG MR. TIM GONZALEZ 4 MR. MARK HOPKINS MR. MARK REYNOLDS, ESQ. 5 MS. LAURA GOODWIN MR. TIM HERNDON 6 COURT REPORTER: 7 Heather Alcaraz, RMR, FCRR Official Court Reporter 515 Rusk, Room 8004 8 Houston, Texas 77002 9 (713)250-558410 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 2.4 25 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript

produced by computer.

```
THE COURT: So with that we're ready for closing
 1
 2
     arguments.
          Ms. Wills, you're going to go first. Whenever you are
 3
     ready, you can begin.
 4
               MS. WILLS: Thank you, Your Honor.
 5
               THE COURT: Give you a minute to set up.
 6
 7
               I think what we'll do, ladies and gentlemen: After
     Ms. Wills goes, we'll take a break -- short break and then go
 8
     through the rest of the closing arguments. And then, like I
 9
     said, we'll order lunch for you.
10
               Art, did we get the order forms?
11
12
               THE CASE MANAGER: I have them.
13
               THE COURT: Okay. So during the break, you can take
14
     care of that.
               All right. Ms. Wills, whenever you're ready.
15
16
               MS. WILLS: Thank you, Your Honor.
17
               Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Well, it's been
     about a week, and it's been a very interesting week. And I
18
19
     really want to thank each and every one of you for coming here
     early every morning, sitting here patiently listening to all the
20
     evidence, listening to the witnesses, carefully paying attention
21
     to everything that was going on because I can tell you that this
22
     case means a great deal to these three plaintiffs that we're
23
24
     here representing.
```

This case means a great deal to Donna Armstrong, to

Tim Gonzalez and to David Lipnicki, and I'd like to thank you on their behalf for coming here, for listening to the evidence, for keeping an open mind, and for paying such close attention. We thank you so much.

This is my opportunity to kind of summarize for you the things that the evidence has shown, what we believe were the really important key pieces of evidence, and to point out to you some of the things that we believe, based on the Court's instructions, will help guide you in making the right decisions here.

So as Judge Costa just told you, there are -- there are two basic issues, right? The first issue is: Were the plaintiffs inside salespeople or were they outside salespeople? And you really can't be both. You're either inside salespeople or you're outside salespeople.

And I submit to you, based on all the evidence that you've heard from the witness stand, from the deposition clips that you've seen of witnesses that also testified under oath, this was an inside sales position.

The second question that you're going to be asked is:

How many hours did these plaintiffs work? And the judge just

told you it's based on an estimation. There are no records.

It's not their fault that there are no records.

Meritage didn't keep records. They could have kept records, but they didn't. So now we're left with their

reasonable estimation, and that's -- that's our only burden, to give you a reasonable estimation of the number of hours that they worked.

So I'd like to talk about this very first question that you're going to need to answer. Were the plaintiffs inside salespeople or were they outside salespeople? And I will tell you that the answer to that question of this being an outside salesperson job is absolutely no.

So the judge just went over the jury instructions with you, and I just want to hit on some of the key ones. I noticed you-all were paying very close attention when he read them, but I just want to focus on some of the key instructions.

So what is the outside sales exemption? It has two basic components. First, the plaintiffs have to have a primary duty of making sales, and here we agree that was the their primary duty, making sales. And we believe and it's our position and the evidence has shown that they actually had two products that they had to sell.

First, they had to sell the new homes, and, secondly, they had to also sell the Meritage MTH mortgages. Meritage required them and actually gave them an uptick on their commissions if they not only sold the new house, but they also sat them down and convinced them to buy a Meritage mortgage as well. So that was their primary job duty.

Now, the second issue is whether the plaintiffs were

customarily and regularly engaged away from the employer's place of business in performing their sales duties. So what's the employer's place of business?

Well, as the judge just outlined, the employer's place of business includes any fixed site, whether it's the plaintiff's home or whether it's an office. And for purposes of this case, that model home that you've heard so much about, including the sales office that's within the model home, that's inside sales.

The Houston corporate office that you've heard about where they had the Monday morning meetings, they did the call-a-thons and the phone solicitations and sometimes they'd have realtors come there to the corporate office, that's all inside sales. The time that they spent in these places, that's inside sales.

So what does "customarily and regularly" mean? Well, what does that mean? Well, the phrase "customarily and regularly" means it has to be a frequency that's greater than occasional. In other words, if you think it's just occasional, you know, maybe they did some sales activity occasionally, that's not enough. If you think it was just something that happened occasionally, that's not outside sales, and that's not customarily and regularly. It has to be greater than occasionally.

Customarily and regularly includes work that is

normally and recurrently -- normally and recurrently performed every workweek. Workweek after workweek after workweek, normally and recurrently.

As the Court also just instructed you, when you're looking at outside versus inside -- what's happening outside and what's happening inside, you have to look at the amount of time. Where were they spending their time? Were they spending their time inside -- inside that model, inside their sales office or inside the corporate office, or were they spending their time outside? You've got to look at where was their time being spent.

And then you have to also look at the relative importance of anything that they did if they ever were outside. Were they outside doing something important, something critical, something that mattered, or were all of the important things being done inside that model home sales office, inside the model, in the corporate office?

If you believe that they're spending most of their time inside, that the important things are being done inside, these ladies and gentlemen are inside salespeople and the outside sales exemption does not apply to them.

So as you get this charge and as you think about this case, ask yourselves -- you heard them all testify. You heard them say the word "rarely." Rarely. You heard them say that they rarely did anything outside of that office.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

They were required to be there. That's where they 2

were supposed to be. That's where they made their sales.

considering customarily and regularly, ask yourself: Were any

outside things being done normally and recurrently workweek

after workweek after workweek?

I think the evidence is exactly the opposite. If you look at what they were doing normally and recurrently, that was all inside the office, inside the model, inside the retail store that they were supposed to man, they were supposed to operate. That's what this job is about. That's what the evidence has shown.

And then, finally, when you're trying to decide customarily and regularly, you need to weigh the amount of time. Are they spending their time inside of the office, or are they spending their time outside of the office? Where are they spending their time?

You heard them testify. They're spending their time in that office because that's where they were required to be. That's where they had to be if they wanted to get an "up," if they wanted to get any sales. They had to be inside.

And then, also, you need to weigh: Where are the important things being done? Are the important things being done inside where they have all their tools, where their model is, where their showroom is, where their retail store is? Are the important things being done inside the office? And if the

important things are being done inside, these are inside salespeople and the outside sales exemption does not apply to them.

So I'd just like to kind of remind you of some of the facts as to why these people are inside salespeople because, again, you can't be both. You can't be inside salespeople and outside salespeople. You can only be one or the other.

And these people, Donna Armstrong, Tim Gonzalez and David Lipnicki, they were inside salespeople. So they worked inside of this beautiful model home. I know you guys are probably tired of hearing about the "wow" factor and how beautiful it is, but they really are stunning and they really are gorgeous. And they're done that way for a reason.

You heard about all the psychoanalytical data that goes into just selecting which model home you're going to have. They actually have study groups and marketing people. They spend thousands and thousands of dollars just trying to make sure that they build the right model home because this model is critical.

This is the heart of what they do. They spend 60, 70, \$80,000, and that's a lot of money just to furnish and decorate these models. This is the heart of what they do, and that's where these people were working, and that's where they were required to work. They are inside salespeople.

All of their tools -- and I won't go into this

ad nauseam, but you've heard repeatedly about their sales tools. That's where they are, okay? You can't sell somebody a home until you sit down with them and you go through your floor plans, you go over the elevations, you go through the feature sheets, you go through the price list, you go through the plat maps.

After you figured out a floor plan, after you figured out an elevation, after you figured out the features, then you have to sit down with the plat map, figure out where you have an available lot and whether or not you can even build that home on that lot. And all of this, ladies and gentlemen, happens inside because these are inside salespeople.

The lot fit analysis, which is what really has to be done before you ever know if the home is actually going to fit on a lot, again, all done inside, ladies and gentlemen. The community information, the tax rates, all of that -- again, these are tools that are inside, ladies and gentlemen.

And it has been unequivocal, unquestionable, all the contracts -- and you can't have a sale unless it culminates in a contract. You've got to have a contract. Every single contract is done inside the model home sales office. Those form contracts are right there on the computers. The salesperson sits there with the buyer, types in the information into the form on the computer.

They print it out right there in the sales office.

They sit there in the sales office. They go through the contract with the buyer, and the buyer signs and executes that contract right there inside the sales office. These are inside salespeople.

I mentioned to you earlier that they had two products that they were selling, and you've heard about this over the last week. The second product that they had to sell was the mortgage. And I don't care if Meritage wants to couch it as encouraging, explaining, trying to get them to do it. Bottom line is they required them, as a part of their job evaluation, to sell the mortgage.

They required a sit-down rate. For everybody that came in there to buy a new home, they had to also try to convince them to buy the Meritage mortgage through MTH Lending, and they would have the mortgage applications right there in the sales office.

(Excerpt of video deposition of Mr. Wade Thomas played as follows)

Q (BY MS. WILLS) And the time that these salespersons spent encouraging, trying to get, trying to capture, trying to get these folks to not just buy that new house but to buy that MTH mortgage as well, that time was spent in the sales office, wasn't it?

A Uh -- oh, first of all, you know, their responsibility was to encourage, uh, and I -- I believe, for the most part, that

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Meritage store, and you've heard evidence over the last week that -- that they had to man this store, that that's where they had to be because they were there to man a store. Just like if they worked at Dillard's or Macy's, they had to man a store, and this store had to be pristine.

They had to even pick up -- it was apparently

Because that's representing our product and so it's our --

it's the way that we -- it's -- it's a -- a -- I quess the

physical vehicle we use to sell homes.

22

23

24

Rick Harvey, the very first man that you saw, he said,

"This is our store. This is what we're using to sell homes."

24

Then you heard from Jeff Grobstein, an officer of the company, a regional vice president.

He said, "It's our store." And then you heard from Steve Harding. You also heard from Steve Harding here on the witness stand. He is the current Houston division president.

There's no question that that model is the store, and they were supposed to be manning the store. This is an inside sales job.

We also know from the compensation agreement that they were required to be present at the sales office. They had to be present there for all business hours on all days.

They were responsible for this Meritage model, this store, seven days a week, and the only way they could get two days off is if they had someone to cover the store when they were going to be out. This is an inside sales position that required them to man this store.

They were also subject to being written up if they were out of the store, outside of the model. You heard Bobby Allen talking about he could remember the 11 people that he actually counseled for being outside of the model. You heard Jeanne Conger tell you, "It's a possibility. I could have written somebody up for being out of the model."

If we look at this one disciplinary action form, this salesperson is being written up and told that she has to make sure the sales office is covered daily from 10:00 to 7:00 and that she would have to inform them prior to being out of the

office for any reason. Any reason that she's out of that office, she's got to give prior notice to management.

She's told in this formal written disciplinary action form that this is a serious situation and that she has to make immediate improvement. And this is a written -- you've heard write-ups were done with human resources. You couldn't just write somebody up.

You had to have human resources. It had to be documented. This is a serious situation, and she's being told in writing if you're going to be out for any reason, you must notify management before you can be gone for any reason.

Here's another disciplinary action form. "Dan is expected to be on time to work every day and work regular business hours." This is an inside sales job. You've got to show up, and you've got to work regular scheduled business hours.

He's also told in this formal disciplinary action form, "The model home must be attended at all times" -- "all times during business hours. Leaving the model unattended by a salesperson and unpresentable leads to a potential loss in sales and a decrease" -- "decrease in profitability for the company."

It's clear, ladies and gentlemen, Meritage wanted their salespeople to be inside that model home sales office.

This is an inside sales job. All of the evidence points to this being an inside sales position.

Now, you've heard the evidence. The plaintiffs were paid on a straight commission basis. They didn't get a sale, they weren't going to get a commission. And you -- you heard Steve Harding say, "You know, sometimes we'd give them a draw."

A draw was basically a loan, which meant that Donna Armstrong could sit there running the Meritage model for 55, 60, 70 hours a week, and at the end of that week she could actually be in the hole to Meritage. She could be there for up to 70 hours that week, and at the end of that week, if she hasn't sold anything, the only thing she might get, if she's lucky, would be a loan from Meritage that she would have to pay back to Meritage later.

That's the way the Meritage system -- their compensation worked. Now, the only way -- the only way under Meritage's system -- and you've heard it repeatedly. The only way you could possibly get a sale was to be present in that sales office. If you weren't there, you weren't going to get a sale, you weren't going to get an "up."

So it is, frankly, preposterous and it strains credibility to believe that somebody is going to be out, I don't know, running around the neighborhood with a walk book and a big plat map or, I don't know, maybe going by a realtor office and dropping off some fliers where they're going to call the call center, that they're going to be out doing those things when the only way — the only way they're going to earn a commission is

to get the prospects, typically?

Α What I would characterize that with is -- yes.

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Excerpt of video deposition of Mr. Jeff Grobstein played as follows.)

Do you believe that getting an up or a prospect that walks in the door, being the person to get to greet that person, do

be not trying to develop their own sales, this is for Meritage.

The evidence is going to show that these fliers they drop off,

24

they direct people to call who? To call this Jennifer lady, the online person. And you heard Steve Harding. Now they have them call the call center.

This isn't work that they were doing to -- if they did it on a rare occasion, to promote their own sales. This was to promote Meritage. And in order to be considered outside sales work, it has to be something in conjunction with their own sales, not something where maybe somebody else is going to get the phone call or maybe somebody else is going to get the sale. It has to be their own work, their own sales.

Which means that all that teamwork you've heard about -- Meritage believes in teamwork. Hey, you got to do teamwork. I don't care if you're not going to get the commission. I don't care if it's not your sale. You still got to pitch in and do teamwork.

That means customer comes in, they're not your buyer, you still got to help them regardless. That means you've got to do customer service even if you never even sold these people a home. They're calling, you got to help them. You've got to do warranty work. They're not my buyer, you still got to do warranty work.

All those things, ladies and gentlemen, those are inside sales activities. The only way they can be outside exempt sales activities is if it's somehow specifically for their own sales.

Now, you heard a lot about marketing. And I'm not going to belabor this, but needless to say, this is a big outfit, okay? They're pretty sophisticated. They've got the realtor relationship manager or business development manager people, whatever you want to call them, but those are the folks that are going out actually forming the relationships with realtors.

They're the ones taking people out to lunch. They're the ones taking people to play golf. They're the ones developing this relationship.

These people didn't even have a budget for something like that -- didn't have a budget. You saw the e-mail. We're not paying any money for you to do any realtor relationship things.

No, the -- the only thing that these folks were allowed to do was maybe have some donuts in their model and invite some realtors to come. You know, host some events right there in their model. That -- that was -- that was what they did, or, you know, they -- they would interact with realtors when they come in with their customers.

I mean, that's the best time to interact with them.

Here they are. They're in your model. They're in your store.

You can show them your product. That's when you interact with them.

They also call them right there from the model home

sales office. They e-mail them right there from the model home sales office. Inside sales. This is an inside sales position.

All of the big marketing stuff -- you saw the "wow" commercial -- wow -- the billboards, the advertisements, the website, the call center, the promotions, all of that, that's all done by the marketing department. And what's the marketing department trying to do? They're trying to drive people to go to the model home sales office where that's where they're going to find the salespeople.

Now, the plaintiffs are inside salespeople. Just to summarize, they worked in a model home sales office selling new homes and mortgages. They were responsible for operating the store. They rarely took customers out for any reason.

So when you're looking at customarily and regularly, it has to be more than occasional. This doesn't even rise to the level of occasional. It has to be more than occasional.

It has to be normally and recurrently done workweek after workweek. The evidence that you've seen -- the only evidence you've seen is that if they ever took anybody anywhere, it was very rare. And if they did, I mean, I don't even know that it was anything important.

You heard from one home buyer of Tim Gonzalez who said, "Yeah. I came in. He had the one perfect home for me. I knew immediately that's the home I want. I want to go see this house."

Now, she wasn't from that area. Her realtor wasn't from that area. So Tim Gonzalez took them over and showed them that inventory home.

Now, that's one buyer, only buyer that Meritage brought in here to you. Now, you heard that an average week, about ten people come into a model home sales office. That's average. Frankly, that's probably low. But that means that over 500 buyers are going to come in a year, and you heard Tim Gonzalez worked there two years.

So in two years he saw over a thousand prospective buyers, and they provided you with one person out of over a thousand where he took her and showed her and her realtor this inventory home — one in a thousand. He told you he could remember three occasions, and we're talking about over a thousand prospective buyers.

That is not customarily and regularly. I would tell you that is the rarest of rare, and that does not rise to the level of outside sales.

It's very clear that they rarely even dropped off these fliers and gave them to the receptionist, but if they did, they weren't making presentations. The realtors weren't even there. They were dropping off some fliers where maybe — maybe one day they'd get a call from that, but more likely than not they were going to call the number on there, which went to the toll free number to the online center.

The evidence is also undisputed that they never ever went to any customer's home or any customer's place of business in order to sell them a new home or a mortgage.

So the very first question you're going to get -- the very first question, question No. 1, is going to be on the outside sales exemption.

Do you find that Meritage -- not us, Meritage. We didn't have to say a thing. This is Meritage. Meritage has to prove to you by a preponderance of the evidence that these three plaintiffs, Donna Armstrong, Tim Gonzalez and David Lipnicki, that they were employed in the capacity of an outside salesperson under the outside sales exemption, and they can't be both.

You're either inside sales or you're outside sales.

And it's very clear here that the outside sales exemption does not apply to these three plaintiffs. So we would ask, when you get this question, for all three of them please check "No."

So the next question you're going to be asked is how many hours did they work each workweek. You heard Donna Armstrong's testimony. She conservatively estimated that she worked an average of 55 to 60 hours a week.

I would submit that Donna deserves to get the higher end of that because she was being conservative in her estimate. Tim Gonzalez estimated 70 hours a week. David Lipnicki estimated 65 to 70 hours a week, and, again, he was being

conservative. I would submit that he should get the higher end of that estimate.

So what are hours worked? Hours worked include all time spent by an employee that was primarily for the benefit of the employer or the employer's business, and it's whether or not the employer knew or had reason to believe that the employee was doing the work.

Well, the evidence shows that -- that they knew. They knew the long hours that they were working. They knew that that sales office was going to be open 363 days out of the year.

They only close two days, Christmas Day and Thanksgiving Day.

That means that New Year's Eve, New Year's Day,
Mother's Day, Father's Day, Fourth of July, Labor Day, Easter,
that sales office was open and these folks were working.

Now, in terms of coming up with a number of hours, I don't want you-all to believe that somehow they have to give you some sort of figures. They can't do that, and the reason that they can't give you an exact number is because Meritage didn't keep time records.

You heard them say they could have kept time records. They even looked at alarm codes. They could have kept records, but Meritage did not follow their requirement to keep records. The law requires the employer to keep the records.

Because they failed to keep records, now we only have their reasonable estimation. And that's all the law requires,

Isn't [sic] also true that in advertising for this position

22

23

24

25

Α

0

than five days a week?

That is possible.

Meritage says that salespersons must be able to work over 40 hours a week, work weekends and nights if necessary?

A Yes, ma'am.

Q And, in fact, they also advertise this position as being one where they have to be available to work, as needed, seven days a week?

A Um, yes, ma'am.

(End of video deposition excerpts.)

MS. WILLS: So the very next question you're going to get -- after you answer question one "no," the next question you're going to get is: How many hours did they work? And the very first person's going to be Donna Armstrong because it's in alphabetical order, and you're going to have a workweek for each week that's within the relevant time period.

So you're not going to have a workweek for the entire time that she worked there. It's only going to be for the time that the Court has determined is the relevant time period.

So you're going to have to put a number into each and every one of those blanks in order for Ms. Armstrong to be able to recover for those hours worked. We're asking that when you get to this question two for Donna Armstrong, that you fill in the number 60 in each and every one of those blanks for each and every week because that is Donna Armstrong's reasonable estimate, and the law says that's -- that's all she's required to do, give you a reasonable estimate.

Her reasonable estimate has in no way been contradicted by Meritage. They've not contradicted her reasonable estimate. Jeanne Conger, who was over Houston who actually worked with Donna -- didn't supervise her but was two levels above her -- said 70 hours is the norm. So 60 hours for Donna is certainly reasonable.

Then you're going to get also as a part of question

two -- and Donna Armstrong's going to be two or three pages of

just blanks with weeks. Then you're going to get to Tim

Gonzalez, which is a shorter period.

We're asking that for each and every blank there for Tim Gonzalez, that you put 70 hours in for Tim, which is the reasonable estimate that he gave. And that's basically what Jeanne Conger told you, 70 hours is the norm for the industry.

Same thing for David Lipnicki. We're asking that you put 70 hours in for each week for David Lipnicki.

Now, I'd like to conclude by sort of stopping where

Mr. McLaughlin started with you last week. Do you remember when
he did his opening statement? He told you that this case was
going to be about credibility, and I believe that it is about
credibility.

And based on everything you've sat here and listened to, what you've seen, what you've heard, I want you to ask yourselves about the credibility of Meritage. Let's look at their credibility. Now, they would have you believe that the

outside sales exemption applies to this clearly inside sales position, so let's take a look at what they did in order to try to one day convince a jury like you of this.

Well, on the very first page of their compensation agreement, they have something that, frankly, defies all credibility. They say, "The associate must customarily and regularly take customers to see model homes."

Well, they're stationed in a model home. They're not going to customarily and regularly take anybody to see a model home because that's where they are. And the evidence has shown that if they wanted somebody to see another model home, they give them directions and send them over to that model home so that the other salesperson could do teamwork and help with somebody else's sale.

Then they go on to say they're also supposed to take them to see sites. Well, ladies and gentlemen, the only way to pick out a site was to select a floor plan, an elevation, and to use that plat map. It completely defies logic that you're going to go out there with some kind of a weird tool kit that nobody ever provided to them with some cones — and Donna's going to be out there. She's going to put on her boots. I think Amy Fisher said her boots were knee high.

You're going to put on some boots and some spray, and you're going to spray out the pool and have some rope. That's not -- that's not credible at all. That's not even logical.

You're not going to take folks out there when you need a surveyor, you need construction people, you need an engineer.

They can't go out there and tell you where your house is going to be built. Completely illogical.

Then they go on to say -- just to show you what little credibility Meritage has, they go on say then they're supposed to call upon customers at their homes. Have you heard a shred of evidence of any salespeople going to somebody's house to sell them a new house? Absolutely defies all credibility.

And then they say --

THE COURT: About five minutes, Ms. Wills.

MS. WILLS: -- you're supposed to travel to various locations -- thank you, Your Honor -- in order to conclude the sales transaction. Ridiculous.

The only evidence that you heard was that the contracts -- which is obviously how you're going to conclude a sales process, right? You got to get the contract -- they happen 100 percent of the time inside of the office.

You heard their vice president of human resources admit the mortgages, 100 percent of the time those were done in the office. They already knew, no, they're not customarily and regularly out selling mortgages.

I ask you to look at the credibility of Meritage and what they brought before you and the kind of evidence that they brought in this courtroom before you. Look at their

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

credibility. They're telling you the outside sales exemption, ladies and gentlemen, they don't even know what the outside sales exemption is. I want you to listen again to Rick Harvey, the guy who's over all of Texas. Twenty-five years he's been with Meritage. I want you to listen to what he has to say about the outside sales exemption. Then I want you to listen to Jeff Grobstein, regional vice president, officer of Meritage. I want you to listen to what they have to say about the outside sales exemption, and then I want you to evaluate the credibility of Meritage. (Excerpt of video deposition of Mr. Richard Harvey played as follows.) What's the outside sales exemption? I don't know. So is it fair to say that you have never undertaken to do anything to determine whether or not any of the salespersons working, in any of the divisions that you've been in charge of, whether or not they are workers that would fall under the outside sales exemption? Α Uh, I -- I haven't done anything personally, no. Q (BY MS. WILLS) Do you know of anything that's been done? Α No. As you sit here today, do you have a belief as to whether or

not the outside sales exemption applies to the -- all those

I'd like to thank you for your time and your attention. And I'll get one more opportunity to talk to you again, but, again, we ask that you look at the credibility of Meritage. Look at what they did. Look at the evidence that they gave you and ask yourselves whether or not you can believe anything that they say.

23

24

```
(Other matters discussed pertaining to jury trial.)
 1
 2
           (Recess taken from 10:08 a.m. to 10:20 a.m.; Discussion had
          regarding student visitors in courtroom.)
 3
           (Jury in at 10:23 a.m.)
 4
               THE COURT: All right. Be seated, everyone.
 5
               All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we have some more
 6
 7
     quests in the courtroom. Some students were touring the
     courtroom today, and they heard we had a trial, so they've come
 8
     to watch the closing argument.
 9
               So with this bigger audience, Mr. McLaughlin, whenever
10
11
     you're ready, you can go ahead.
12
               MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Your Honor. May it please
     the Court, counsel, good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Nice to
13
     be able to talk to you-all again.
14
               First, I want to thank you for your service, paying as
15
     close attention as you paid during this trial and the time
16
     you've put into it. You've been a very attentive jury. Thank
17
     you very much for that.
18
19
               Now, as you all know, when you come here, you bring
     something special with you. You bring your common sense. You
20
     bring it in here every day. It's something you use every day of
21
     your lives, and it guides you in the decision-making analyses,
22
     judgments, et cetera. And in this case common sense is going to
23
     play a major role in the decision you reach.
24
```

You've heard a lot of testimony, obviously, seen a lot

of evidence. You've seen documents. You've seen videos. Now you get to sum all that together and decide what it all means.

I want to start by talking about the sales agreements real quick, and we've already talked about those. These are -- Defendants' Exhibit 19 is the one I'm talking about right now, but as you know there are several in the record.

Now, why do you suppose the plaintiffs never put these two things on the screen together? I did it in opening, as I recall, or talked about them both in opening, and they're still germane. You have 2A that you heard about plenty that talks about the sales manager customarily and regularly taking customers to see model homes and sites, and you have the other provision about presence in the sales office.

You've seen both of these. You've seen them together. You've seen them separate.

It is preposterous to take the position that a contract that requires the plaintiffs to leave the office prohibits the plaintiffs from leaving the office. This is just one example of the inherent inconsistency that runs through their entire case. Again, I raised it in opening. I want to raise it now.

They want to cherry-pick from documents. They want to cherry-pick from -- from a holistic view of the world and just pick out certain things and tell you-all that those certain things are the only things that matter and you should ignore

everything else.

I also want to talk quickly about the commissions part of this. You've heard a lot about the plaintiffs being paid commissions. The only point I want to make with it right here is that out there in the real world, compensation drives behavior. It always does.

The manner in which someone is paid will affect how they behave, how they perform. And all I'm saying by that is someone who is paid only by commission is, by the nature of the beast, going to do everything conceivable to behave in a manner that creates more opportunity. People who are paid with a commission, especially a commission only, are not people who sit around on their hands hoping that opportunity knocks.

Instead, they go out and they find opportunity, and these folks have testified that they're go-getters. They're not folks who just sit around. They're folks who are incentivized to succeed, and they've talked about the sales of houses and all that. I'll talk a little more about it, but that's really the point I want to make on commissions.

Now, another part of the contract I want to talk about real fast is paragraph 8 in the standards of excellence. You may recall there was a lot of testimony about this escorting a customer to a homesite. And if the plaintiffs could, they would rewrite this to say, "I understand that escorting a customer to a plat map is the highest and best use of some of my time," but

it doesn't say that, does it?

It says a homesite, folks. A homesite is a homesite, and it's okay if there's dirt on it. I think, as Ms. Conger pointed out very articulately, that even this courthouse rests on dirt. There's nothing wrong with dirt.

A homesite's a homesite, not a plat map, okay? And I'm going to get to that a little bit more, but right now I want to -- I want to pause, and I want to note another thing about this case that is really fascinating.

It's fascinating that they are here telling you that they did not do a job they were trained to do. They did not do the job they were supposed to do. They did not do the job they agreed to do, and yet they want you to give them overtime for not doing what they were supposed to do. There's a tad bit of irony wrapped up in that concept, and it's another inherent inconsistency that runs throughout their case. It's a problem they cannot escape.

I want to talk now a little bit about admissions from the plaintiffs, and I started this case in opening talking about some -- what I'd call blackboard statements. You know, back in the day when I was a football player and coach and you talk about the other side made a blackboard statement, that means you go back -- in the old days, you know, you have chalkboards and all that stuff, and you'd write whatever they said on a chalkboard.

We're going to see -- we're going to see if that lasts. How's it going to be in the fourth quarter? Where we are -- pardon the football analogy, by the way -- in the fourth quarter, and you still can't sell a house over the phone. And they know it, and they've run away from it. They're their words, and they've run away from it because they're untenable. That's Ms. Armstrong.

You know, your next statement -- blackboard statement is Mr. -- Mr. Lipnicki. "To be a highly motivated sales professional who is well organized as well as detail oriented, I also look to continue to utilize my sales experience and my training in the Gold Tier program."

You may not remember, but I asked Mr. Lipnicki -- he was sitting right there (indicating), and I asked him,

"Continue" -- "'Continue' means you've been doing it, and you're going to do it some more, right?" And he couldn't answer the question. He ultimately just, "I can't answer the question."

Well, no, you can't because the question completely undermines your case. That's why you can't answer the question. Because you can answer questions unless the answer's fatal, and it's fatal to Mr. Lipnicki to admit that that was a true statement.

He can't admit it's a true statement, so he has to take a position that he just can't answer it because he's also not willing to say it was a lie.

You have another statement like this from

Mr. Gonzalez, "I have visited schools, day cares, churches,

local shops and realtor offices."

That's a lot of places and a lot of pleurals, and he turned those pleurales into two trips, as I recall — two trips. That is a blackboard statement. And, you know, it's great that there's e-mail these days, right, because if we were 20 years ago and there's no e-mail, I don't know how you capture all this.

But what we have in these statements -- and I'll talk about this a little more -- are captured moments in time. It's like a photograph. They said something. They wish they could take it back. They can't because it's captured.

And let's talk about that a little more. The other thing I really want to point out -- well, let's go to the next slide. We'll talk about their declarations.

And y'all may remember Ms. Laura Goodwin talked a little bit about the declarations from the plaintiffs, and what you have -- I'm going to give you exhibit numbers -- in the record, Defendants' Exhibit 14, 15, 38, 39, 49 and 50. Those are six declarations from these three plaintiffs, and I want to talk a little bit about how those changed over time, okay?

The first thing you'll note is that the first declaration from 2010, you see in paragraph 4, "In a typical week I spent over 90 percent of my normal workday in the sales

office." Now, query. Is that a true statement? I say it's not.

I say they spent far more time outside than inside. I say they spent over 60 percent of their time in the sales office, but we'll get to what is my basis for that in a minute. If you take that as a baseline, and if they claim they worked 70 hours a week, you're somewhere around six hours a week engaged in outside sales activities. And I'll submit to you right now, six hours a week engaged in outside sales activities is customarily and regularly, and Meritage wins right there.

But I'll move -- I'll move on, and I'll build on that.

The next thing you see is this "rarely" -- I don't know if the word "rarely" has ever been used so much in four days of trial.

Rarely. What does "rarely" mean?

Now, you remember Mr. Lipnicki was sitting up here, and I asked him what it meant. And he basically said it means two to three times a month, and we talked about -- you may or may not remember -- a litany of activities two or three times a month.

Two to three times a month -- and, again, granted that my math isn't good. I think we talked about 12 to 18 times a month, Mr. Lipnicki and I, on cross-examination on "rarely."

And we were talking about showing spec homes, showing homesites, going to see realtors, showing homes under construction, touring the community with a buyer, and you may recall that from the

mystery shop where all you saw was the sky and some clouds, if you remember the video.

So what do these rarelies [sic] add up to? These rarelies add up to 12 to 18 times a month, and they all use "rarely." Now, look, I think -- I think that they have to concede -- and I challenge them to explain this to you, by the way. How does "rarely" in paragraph 6 become "very rarely" in paragraph 4? Why did that happen?

I -- you go from, "I rarely left the sales office to show prospective homebuyers spec houses and vacant lots," to, "I very rarely left the model home for any other purpose." In a typical week -- how did over 90 percent at the top there turn into well over 90 percent on the bottom? What's going on?

Why can't they just say one thing and stick to it?
Why does it keep changing? If it's truth, it doesn't change.
Truth is what it is. It's not relative, okay? It doesn't, a couple years later, turn into something more favorable for my case. That's not how the system works.

And I'm going -- I've got some time to spend on credibility, as Ms. Wills pointed out, and I'll tell you right now Meritage paints with a broad brush. Anyone who took that stand and didn't tell the truth, got to flush their testimony because that's not okay.

So moving on to the next part of the declaration -- and, again, you can compare these for yourself. And, by the

way, do you recall Mr. Gonzalez over there sitting up here and saying that he -- I think he said he typed his declaration or wrote it or whatever. I think he said it was his words, and he wrote it up.

I wonder if he wrote the other ones because guess what? They -- if they're not identical, they are as close as you can get. I don't want to say they're identical because there may be a word here or there that I'm wrong about, but you'll have a chance to look at them.

And ask yourselves: If Mr. Gonzalez wrote his, why are they all the same? That mean he wrote everybody's, or maybe did everybody just get together and come up with the same statement and then come up with another one later that's a little bit different?

Anyhow, on this -- on this one, again, this is from the first one. "On average I would show prospective homebuyers spec houses and vacant lots no more than two to three times a month." I'm just dwelling on this "two to three times a month" and "rarely" because at a baseline position, that's enough. That's enough to be customarily and regularly. That's enough for Meritage to win.

But, again, I think they recognize that too, and they said, oh, oops, we got to come up with something different. Now it's, "I rarely, if ever" -- both those two words, "if ever," those are important words. They're not in the first one. Why

are they in the second one? Again, does truth change, or is truth what it is?

The other thing I think I ought to point out really fast about this inconsistency is you recall all this stuff about, well, we couldn't leave the model. Contract prohibited us from leaving the model. Well, did or didn't?

Why is it that when Mr. Lipnicki's up here talking to his lawyer, the word "present" in paragraph 2F means accountable? Why is it that when I asked him, "Oh, so present means accountable? You just knew you had to be accountable for the sales office" -- why is it when I asked him that, he said, "No, no. I'm going to change my testimony. It means physically present."

I mean, in the span of 30 minutes you get two very different stories. And why is it that when Ms. Wills showed you Briana Rogan's (phonetic) disciplinary action form, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 25, why didn't she show you the rest of what it said in there? Because it doesn't say anything about being physically attached to the model.

It says -- and you can look when you go back -- Briana Rogan was gone for three hours for this, had a doctor's appointment and didn't tell anybody, and it goes into this idea that the model needs to be attended. Not by Briana Rogan, just attended. Pick up a phone, call your boss, "I'm not going to be there. I need coverage," work it out. That's what, you know,

grown-ups do with jobs, right?

The other disciplinary action form that she showed you and didn't show you all of was one Daniel McManaman (phonetic).

If you read that when you go back there and look at the evidence, you're going to see that he, too, was sort of AWOL.

It's not an issue of he wasn't sitting at his desk in the model.

It's an issue of he's not coming to work on time.

Now, there's something to complain about. Gosh, we got to come to work on time. Isn't that awful? I mean,

Meritage should be ashamed for requiring its employees to come to work on time or to be -- you know, to be responsible for covering the model home.

That's all we're talking about in this case is coverage of the model home. That's all we're talking about.

What they're telling you isn't true, and they know it. And you saw the training materials. I'm not going to run through all that stuff again.

But do you really think Meritage is training its sales associates to go visit realtors, go do this, engage in the preparation activities and the eight-step process, demonstrate homesites, do all these things that clearly require you to be out of the office, and yet they're prohibited from being out of the office? So I wanted to throw that in again because I think it's very important.

Now, you heard this talk about a thousand prospects

just now. Why did Meritage only bring one buyer? Well, I got two things to say about that.

First is we brought one buyer out of the three

Mr. Gonzalez referenced in his testimony, and that one buyer sat

here and said, "Oh, yeah, he showed me the house. He took me to

the community," after he sat here and told you he didn't.

If we had one out of three that clearly shows he wasn't telling you the truth and he did engage in those activities, what would a thousand show you? Is it even rational to think that a thousand people came through in a couple of years and saw Mr. Gonzalez and only one of them went out to see a house with him?

You may remember when Mr. Lipnicki was up here, I was talking about three in one week. We were talking about that one-week period, you had three come in. We showed a little exhibit on it. Two of them were on a Saturday, one during the week, and I was trying to establish, okay, so a baseline low threshold of visitors would be, you know, three per week in a given year.

I think the -- I think the Court judicially noted 3 times 52 equals something. I don't remember. Point is -- point is, that's a lot of people.

That is a lot of people, and that's why, when I said 90 percent of their -- over 90 percent of their time in the sales office, no way. No way, okay? If you're seeing a

thousand people in two years, you're out way more than five or six hours, although five or six hours, we win. I'll talk about that later.

Now, on the declarations, I just want to -- I want to wrap up the declarations, and I want to note, again, what I'm talking about right now is what they've admitted to, okay? And whether it's a declaration or whether it's sitting up here, things like Ms. Armstrong saying she showed -- I believe it was a spec -- when it made sense, things like that.

We've got testimonial items where they've admitted certain things two to three times a month, what have you. From that I want to build into something that -- okay. Now I want to talk about the mystery shops real quick. Those mystery shops are, once again, captured moments in time.

And, you know, I'm going to -- if we could visualize this captured-moments-in-time thing as a blank white board, maybe like one of those back there (indicating) -- just a blank white board, and every now and then we put a mark on it. Maybe the mark is for 12 to 18 times a month, if you put all those marks on there. Maybe the mark is for mystery shops, okay?

Mr. Lipnicki -- now, they started this case running for the hills from mystery shops. You may or may not recall, but in opening statement they dealt with it because mystery shops scare them to death. So they had to tell you, oh, that's fake. It's not a real buyer. I don't know how many times you

heard that, a bunch of times.

Well, why? Why does it matter? I mean, why are they worried about it? If they really never left, why didn't they just say, well, you know, these mystery shops reflected a real thing, and we were just lying to our employer. We were just misrepresenting to the company that this is how we do our job. We're sorry. We probably shouldn't have, but we never left.

Why didn't they just say that? They didn't say that. In fact, Mr. Lipnicki, again, agreed -- you know, they went through the whole fake thing. And I asked him, "Mr. Lipnicki, even though you say that was a fake thing, was your performance real?"

Answer: "Yes."

"And that reflected the truth about how you did your job, didn't it?"

Answer: "Yes."

Captured moments in time, more admissions. These mystery shops are these plaintiffs representing to Meritage back in the day how they did their job, and you should accept those representations as true. And if those mystery shops are how they did their job, it's not just how they did their job on the mystery shops, it's how they did their job every time a buyer visited who wanted to see something. And if there's a thousand buyers, there's a lot of visits where a buyer wants to go look at a house.

And does anybody seriously think that a buyer's content to look at a plat map on a wall and say, "Yeah, those look like nice lots. Sign me up"?

No chance. No chance. You want to see the dirt. You want to see the trees. You may even want to see the horse farm Mr. Harding talked about. Maybe not, but that's real life.

That's real-world stuff.

You also -- they talked a lot -- well, I'm going to -- run away. They're running away from the mystery shops. They're caught on the mystery shops, and those are real.

Now, what else have they done that you can realistically consider fleeing, fleeing from the scene, kind of? Here's one. Why all this talk about the "up" system? Who cares?

Mr. Lipnicki never had a sales partner. Mr. Gonzalez never had a sales partner. Ms. Armstrong never testified that she had a sales partner although counsel referred to it when talking to Ms. Conger. So your record there's just sort of nebulous.

Maybe she did, maybe she didn't. Maybe she did for just a little period of time near the end of her employment.

Record's not real clear. But why -- and you remember Bobby

Allen? And I asked Mr. Allen who -- you know, we had our differences, I guess. We'll get to that.

But I asked Mr. Allen, "Mr. Allen, does it make sense

to sit in here and talk about the 'up' system when none of the plaintiffs experienced it?"

And even Mr. Allen had to agree with me on that, so why are we talking about the "up" system? Why are they spending time on stuff that doesn't matter, doesn't pertain to the case?

Why are we talking about fluffing pillows? I'll bet you there's an hour spent on fluffing pillows and turning lights on and listening to music and, I don't know, picking stuff up off the floor, whatever it was. Remember that checklist of all — have you heard anyone from Meritage say they don't do those things? I don't think you have.

In fact, I know you haven't because they do them.

It's fine. They do some things inside. They do some things outside. Meritage is very comfortable with that. You know why?

Because that's reality. That's how it went down.

Fluffing pillows is a distraction. The "up" system is a distraction. Look over here, don't look over here. Look at the "up" system.

Selling mortgages is a distraction. Who cares? Who cares? Being at work on time, whining about that, that's a distraction, okay? And, again, look at the exhibits, and you'll see that they say much more than what Ms. Wills told you about when she was up here.

The last thing I'll say about the mystery shops is Mr. Gonzalez doesn't have one, okay, and we've acknowledged

that. We had something better, though. We had Ms. McClellan, who was a buyer and who told you how Mr. Gonzalez did his job.

Now, I want to move over to credibility. I -- as I said at the beginning of the case, credibility is the most important thing in this case. And you as the jurors have the unique ability and province of determining credibility of witnesses.

And I believe we have a -- I believe you have in your charge an instruction from the Court on credibility, and this is it. "As the sole judges of the facts, you must determine the credibility or believability of each witness and what portion of his or her testimony you accept and what weight you attach to it."

Now, I'm going to start with Amy Fisher, who you heard from yesterday. Amy Fisher was not credible, to say the least, and there is no running away from that. And we were shocked and disappointed by what we heard, and you should -- you should hold that against her. What she told you should not be anything you consider as true because if a witness sits up here and says anything that you don't think is true, you should abandon everything else the witness told you, okay?

But as I said, we're going to paint with a broad brush on credibility.

Now, before I -- before I move on on credibility, I also want to talk about something Ms. Wills just told you-all.

She showed you a portion of the jury charge that pertained to recordkeeping, and that portion of the charge reads -- it's on page 15 of the charge when you get it. "If employees are not exempt under the FLSA," comma -- well, there it is. The law requires an employer to keep records of how many hours its employees work, et cetera.

What she showed you did not include the clause "if employees are not exempt under the FLSA." Question: Why not? Why not show you everything?

Now, moving on, let's talk about credibility. If -oh, actually, before I do that, let me talk about Mr. Grobstein
and Mr. Harvey not knowing anything about the outside sales
exemption.

Do you remember that Ms. Wills played you video from a guy named Wade Thomas, the vice president of human resources?

She didn't play you anything with her asking him anything about the outside sales exemption, did she? Instead, she asked a bunch of division presidents who are worried about building houses. Why? Why? You know, look here, don't look here.

Now, Donna Armstrong up here took the position that she did not have remote access until Ms. Silver pulled out one of those e-mails again -- one of those inconvenient e-mails -- "I will check my e-mails while I am out of the office." Well, how would you do that if you didn't have remote access? And why would you sit up here and say you don't have remote access if in

fact you do?

You heard Mr. Harding talking about remote access being available for all sales associates as of 2007. Here's why. Here's why they won't admit they had remote access until Ms. Armstrong had to. They got a bunch of e-mails they want you to look at that show they were sent after model home hours, and they're trying to tell you those e-mails -- if one was sent at 10:00, let's say for example, that means somebody worked three hours past 7:00, past the closing point.

So they had to take the position that they didn't have remote access to make you believe that. Oops, they did. They did, and that means they could have just sent a snippet of an e-mail investing five minutes of time versus the three hours they would claim on that day I gave you the example of.

Ms. Armstrong also took the position that you can -that she could show homesites and inventory or spec homes in
several different ways. "I can show it on my plat map." So if
we had a plat map here -- and I won't get one -- say, well,
that's where the spec is, I'm showing a spec home.

So all those e-mails where -- Ms. Silver went through them with her where she's saying I showed this, I showed that, I'd love to show you this, et cetera, she had to come up with some different meaning for the word "show" other than the common sense contextual meaning you would take away from the e-mail.

And she had to do that because they don't want to

admit they were outside any more than what they've admitted. So "show" doesn't mean show, basically. There's some other things like that, and I want to move to those.

Mr. Lipnicki -- Mr. Lipnicki took the position that the training Meritage gave him tempted him to violate his contract by leaving the model home sales office. He also said that "take" doesn't mean take. "Continue" -- I already talked about that -- doesn't mean continue. And you can visit people by e-mail.

Now, when you see "visit" in the ordinary connotation of the word and you -- and contextually we're talking about that realtor relation stuff, go and visit realtors. And he was telling you, "Well, I did go visit when I sent him an e-mail."

"Visit" doesn't mean visit.

If we can't even get folks to get up here and say that "visit" means visit and "take" means take and "continue" means to continue, there's not a word that comes out of their mouths that you can rely on. It's not credible. Why? Why won't they even grant common sense meaning to words they used back in the day? Why?

Now, Mr. Gonzalez -- and I got to tell you, this is a personal favorite of mine. Berry -- I remember Ms. Williams asking -- and I'll confess I didn't know what was next. But she asked about "berry," and, you know, I'm thinking, okay. And Mr. Gonzalez said, "Well, those are strawberries," and I'm

thinking, okay, kind of a weird lunch, but okay, strawberries.

And then we move on to the Chili's receipt, and we see that Berry is actually Mr. Berry, not a bunch of strawberries.

And at that point Mr. Gonzalez had to throw in the towel and concede that he kind of didn't recall. Berries, strawberries,

Mr. Berry? I mean, if -- if you can't even rely on a witness to sit up here and say, "Yeah, I took a Mr. Berry to lunch one time" -- just one time -- if you can't even rely on that, how can you rely on anything they say? You can't.

All right. Now, where am I going with all of that?

Well, I've talked about Ms. McClellan, so I'm going to tell you where I'm going now. I'm going to talk about inferences next and why -- oh, I'm sorry, Bobby Allen. I don't want to forget Bobby Allen.

You guys remember Bobby Allen. The first thing I want to point out about Bobby Allen is you recall him saying it was a hostile environment when -- when the lawyer came and took his statement from me [sic]. That was hostile. I -- you know, she made stuff up. She -- I was very offended that she used the word "expectations" instead of suggestions because that's -- obviously, that's offensive, right? I mean, that's a horrible -- horrible thing for someone to do.

And then you can walk a spec home while you're sitting in an office. You can walk homes under construction while you're sitting in an office. This man sat up here and said this

under oath.

You can drive the community while you're sitting in an office. You can make at least one realtor visit a week while you're sitting in an office. Now, why did he -- why did he say things that obviously preposterous? It can't be that he just misunderstood a question because it happened four times.

Just -- why I kept asking him.

Why would he accuse Ms. Becraft, whom you met, of creating some sort of hostile environment to take a statement from him? You heard her saying, "Oh, no, he helped. He was cooperative. He actually looked at it while I was typing it and had input" and all of that.

Well, you talk about two widely different stories, which one's believable? Who has the agenda? Who has the dog in the fight?

You heard Mr. Allen saying, "Hey, if they lose, I lose." That's the same thing as saying I got to toe the line. I got to say whatever they're saying, whatever they want me to say, so I can live to fight another day.

Not only should you discount this stuff that's just clearly incredible, you should draw some inferences from it, okay? When -- when I take someone to lunch or go somewhere in my car with a guest -- as you might recall, the passenger seat is always horizontal, okay, because I've got this 6'6"

15-year-old kid who does nothing but sleep on the way to school

and sleep on the way home. I don't even know if my passenger seat sits up anymore.

So people join me, and they're like, "Who's been sleeping in your car? That's weird." And I'm thinking, how do you know someone was sleeping? Answer, well, I infer it. You got a horizontal passenger seat, I'm going to reach an inference someone's sleeping in your car every day.

If these folks had come in here and made these preposterous statements and testimony that I've just reviewed with you, what can you infer from that? Remember we had a baseline when I was talking earlier of things they've admitted. You can build on those admissions — not that you need to because we win without it, but you can build on those admissions. And you build on those admissions with inferences that there is something they're hiding. And what is that?

What they're hiding is the fact that mystery shops showed a day in the life. It showed how they did the job regularly and customarily. What they're hiding from is the fact that all those e-mails that Ms. Armstrong had out there, captured moments in time, shows how she did her job customarily and regularly.

And if you think back to that white space like I'm talking about over there and you mark all these captured moments in time, you still have a lot of empty space. How do you fill that space? You fill it with inferences. You fill it with

inferences based on why these three people and Bobby Allen came into this courthouse and told basically the same story over and over again, a story that simply cannot be true. It just cannot be true.

THE COURT: You used about half your time.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

So fill the white space.

Now, let's talk about the jury charge a little bit, and I -- actually, I'm going to sit down way before my time's up, give y'all a break, but let's talk about the jury charge a little bit. This is the part on inferences -- excuse me.

"While you are to consider only the evidence in the case, you are permitted to draw such reasonable inferences as seem justified in the light of common experience." It is justified to infer that the empty space is filled with inferences that they were out all the time. They were out a lot. Even their baseline admission is just the beginning, tip of the iceberg.

Next, I want to talk about the customarily and regularly portion of the charge. And you see that this says, "It means a frequency that must be greater than occasional but which, of course, may be less than constant. Tasks or work performed customarily and regularly includes work normally and recurrently performed every workweek. It does not include isolated or one-time tasks."

Now -- and I don't have the next sentence on there.

Ms. Wills has showed it to you. She probably will again. The next -- the next sentence is the one that she's trying to tell you requires some sort of amount of time component, and she told you a lot of things that are not in the charge about this.

You're just concerned with were they out, was it -were the functions they were engaged in relatively important -that's how the language of the charge works -- and answer those
questions in conjunction with this. Were they outside?
Clearly, they were outside.

And the next part of the charge tells you -- I want to go down to -- well, I want to start there. "Properties located within the Meritage subdivision but outside the model homes, such as other lots for sale, and places outside the Meritage communities are not part of the employer's place of business."

In this case, the way this charge has been given to you by the Court, Meritage's place of business is that sales office model home — the model home sales office and the corporate office. You heard some testimony that the plaintiffs may have gone to the corporate office for training once a week or whatever. Those are the two places that are Meritage's places of business.

Every spec home, any model home that wasn't a model home from which they were officing, okay, lots, communities, realtors, all of that was stuff away from the employer's place

of business, and it all counts, okay?

Now, the other thing I want to point out is the last paragraph there. "Exempt outside sales work includes work performed incidental to and in conjunction with the employee's own outside sales or solicitations." Now, everything they did was incidental to their own sales or solicitation.

They were not -- you heard no evidence that they were working for someone else's sales. Ms. Wills is trying to say that the fact that they were out so much that Meritage had to use a call center number, she's trying to tell you that means the sales could have gone anywhere.

There's no evidence of that at all. There's no evidence of that at all. All that shows you, the call center stuff, is, as Mr. Harding said, they were out too much for us to put a number for the model home sales office. We had to put a call center number, and the call center would direct the lead to the sales associate. Everything they did was work incidental to their own sales or their own solicitations as it says right there.

Now, the -- the fundamental sort of bottom line here is the last question I want to talk to you about, and this is the question that we're going to ask you to answer, and I'll get to that in a minute.

"Do you find that Meritage has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the following plaintiffs were

employed in the capacity of an outside salesperson under the outside sales exemption?" Preponderance of the evidence, that is — if you use my lowbrow football analogy, that is crossing the 50-yard line just barely. That is 50.05 percent rather than 49.95 percent.

A preponderance is just more likely than not. Is it more likely than not that the following plaintiffs were employed in the capacity of outside salespersons? Capacity, there's an interesting word.

Meritage certainly thought so, right? And now the plaintiffs are here saying, "Well, no. You know, yeah, we signed all that stuff. We did the training. We -- we performed on the mystery shops. We represented to Meritage by virtue of our performance on the mystery shops that we were performing in the capacity of an outside salesperson, but we would now like to come into federal court and change our mind.

"We'd like to change our mind. We'd like to change our story. We'd like to run away from everything we said back in the day on all of our e-mails, the mystery shops, everything else. We've -- and our -- by that, our declarations, too. We didn't like our first set of declarations, so we did a second set.

"We didn't love that, so when we came here, we kind of nuanced that, too. So our three or four stories we've told, we'd like to run away from all of that, and we deny we were

employed in the capacity of an outside salesperson."

Now, I've said why I think Meritage wins and, again, talking about what they've admitted, I layered on top of that the credibility issue, and I've asked you-all to make some inferences above and beyond what they've admitted. And the fundamental bottom-line truth here is they were employed in the capacity of an outside salesperson, each one of them.

You should answer -- Meritage is asking you and I'm asking you to answer each one of those questions yes. Answer each one of those questions yes, case is over, and that's how this should end. It should go no further.

In the off chance that you don't answer "Yes" and you decide to go further, I have to address the hours issue because I don't get to come up here again. I'm done, and Ms. Wills has got another 20 minutes. And so you listening to me is over -- probably a good thing for you-all, but it's over now. And so on hours, all I want to say is remember remote access, remember the tearoom.

I mean, how can they credibly take the position that they worked all these hours? They've got nothing to show you on these hours. They -- they're critical of Meritage saying, well, Meritage doesn't have any records, and they forgot to tell you that Meritage doesn't have to keep records for -- for exempt folks, okay? They didn't mention that.

So how does Ms. Armstrong have a second, whatever,

business -- a tearoom that she's going to quite a bit in these captured moments of time? You know she went a lot more than what we caught her on. How does Mr. Gonzalez have time to be reading because no one's dropping by, and he has to tell you up here, "Well, I was reading a lot of contracts"?

You know, how do they deny remote access when they had remote access, and it's obvious? It's all an effort to make you believe they worked far more hours than they worked. Granted, Meritage has no records to show you how many hours these people worked. It didn't keep records. It didn't have to because the answer to that question is yes, and that's the end of the inquiry.

Thank you very much for your time and for your attention. We really, really appreciate it. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Wills, your rebuttal?

MS. WILLS: Yes, Your Honor, just a brief rebuttal.

Ladies and gentlemen, one thing I'd agree that

Mr. McLaughlin said. I'd like you to use your common sense
here. He's right, your common sense. I want you to use your
common sense and ask you: Does your common sense tell you that
they're inside sales or outside sales? Because they can't be
both.

You have to decide: Is this an inside sales job?

Because if it's an inside sales job, Meritage should have been keeping up with all those alarm codes that they were checking

that they can't seem to find these days. Meritage should have been keeping time records because this is an inside sales job.

Now, for some strange reason Meritage wants you to believe that the "up" system was just something that only happened when you had two people in an office and there were altercations, which you heard about those.

People were fighting over customers. They weren't going to be out dropping off some fliers or, I don't know, wandering around with that look book or wandering around with that kit. They were actually fighting over the customers that came into the office.

The "up" system -- and you heard the executive say it.

Not my words, you heard the words straight out of their mouths.

The "up" system meant that you had to be present to get a sale.

There's no question about that. If you weren't there, you weren't going to get a sale. You had to be there in the model home sales office because this is an inside sales job.

Now, he made -- Mr. McLaughlin made a big deal of saying Wade Thomas -- you remember him? Vice president of human resources. I showed you the clip from him, Wade Thomas, vice president of human resources.

Now, it's interesting that plaintiffs are the only ones that showed you any testimony from Mr. Thomas. He's their vice president of human resources. Why wasn't he here testifying to you?

You know, I -- I showed you -- I showed you testimony from the vice president of human resources, and I specifically asked him the question about whether or not these mortgages were being customarily and regularly sold outside of the office, and he said no, of course not. Meritage knew that. This was all inside sales work that they were doing with these mortgages.

We're not running away from anything, ladies and

We're not running away from anything, ladies and gentlemen. We're the only ones that showed you testimony from their executives, and I mean the high-up executives.

I'm talking Rick Harvey, the guy that's been with Meritage for 25 years who's over all of Texas, the guy that can hire and fire a whole bunch of people, the guy that was in charge of everything. We're the only ones that presented his testimony to you.

We're not the ones who are running away here. We're not the ones who are running away from the truth here.

Now, you've seen a lot of e-mails. You're going to get them. You're going to have a chance to look at them. When you look at these e-mails, you'll see things like Donna Armstrong, 8:09 at night, saying, "Sorry my report is late. I was working with a buyer that couldn't decide tonight."

Another e-mail she sent at 7:28 p.m. "Sorry, David.

My last customer just left."

When you read those e-mails, it's going to be very clear to you these inside salespeople, Donna and David and Tim,

they're in the office. This is an inside sales position.

Now, I just want to be clear about customarily and regularly. We talked about that. Customarily and regularly must be greater than occasional, more than occasionally, okay?

If it's just occasionally, that's not enough. It's got to be more than occasionally. It also has to be work that is normally and recurrently performed every workweek -- normally and recurrently performed every workweek.

And when you're trying to decide customarily and regularly, you've got to do a balancing. That's the Court's instruction to you. You're supposed to consider the relative amount of time spent inside the office versus outside of the office.

Now, Mr. McLaughlin showed you their declarations.

They've always maintained that, "I spent well over 90 percent of my time in the model home sales office," and they later added most of the other time was spent up at the corporate office.

Both of those are inside sales. They're Meritage's places of business. We're not running away from anything.

What you didn't hear and what you haven't seen any evidence of is -- they're the ones with the burden. Why didn't they come in here and show you what percentage of time they claimed they're working outside of the office? That's because this is an inside sales position.

And then the other thing that the Court's instructions

tell you to do: Look at the amount of time. I mean, some workweeks they told you, "I spent 100 percent of my time in the sales office, in the model home or at the corporate office."

So the second thing you've got to do is you've got to weigh the importance. Where are the important things happening?

Are they happening inside Meritage's places of business, that model home, that sales office, or are they happening outside?

You have seen it. Everything that's important, that's critical is happening right there inside that model home sales office.

Even Mrs. McClellan, the homebuyer you saw, she sat right there and told you, "It didn't matter whether Tim Gonzalez showed me and my realtor that house or not. I was going to buy it. What he did didn't matter. That wasn't important to me."

No. The important things here happened inside the model home sales office.

Now, finally, I have to tell you I was shocked -- I was shocked when I heard Mr. McLaughlin get up here and talk to you about credibility, talk to you about fleeing the scene and running away. I think he just told you Meritage is now ready to flush -- I think his words were "flush away" Amy Fisher's testimony.

Amy Fisher, that young woman that you saw here, she was handpicked by Meritage. All the salespeople they had, they went and they handpicked this young woman. Six weeks ago they

had their lawyers meeting with this young woman.

Then, just before her testimony, they were sitting —
they were meeting with her. These lawyers were meeting with
Amy Fisher, and now they're ready to flush her away. They put
that young woman on the stand — after meeting with her, sitting
down with her, talking to her, then they put her up here on the
stand.

This young woman worked there 12 years, and they handpicked her. They put her on that stand. Their lawyers met with her. They talked to her, and then they put her up here.

And what did Amy Fisher do? There's no question. She wasn't honest with you. She was completely dishonest.

But Meritage put her on that stand. The only reason she got on that stand and she said the things that she did was because she was trying to support a ridiculous story that Meritage came into this courtroom to tell you.

So she sat up there, and she said, "Sunday" -- just two days ago Sunday -- "was a typical workday for me, my normal, typical workday," and from then on she lied about everything, what she did that day.

She told you, "I took three customers out to see inventory homes." She told you their names, the addresses where she took them, the inventory homes that she took them to see, and she did all this because she was trying to support this ridiculous story that Meritage wants you to believe.

So she sat up there saying all these things. "Oh, my gosh. I had just a few pieces of traffic, and I was taking people out and they were following me in my car. And I had my car seat in the back, and so they followed me." I mean, a whole story -- a whole fabricated story.

But we know what the truth is. You actually got to see, for the first time, a real day in the life of a Meritage salesperson. A real-world day, okay? You heard from Shelly Schiebe, HP -- former HPD officer, 30 years. She does fraud investigations.

You heard from her. She put Amy Fisher under surveillance. We wanted to see what is a real -- what does a real day look like.

She sat there, and she watched Amy Fisher go into that model home at 11:54 a.m. Amy Fisher never left the entire day. She stayed in that model home sales office the entire day, and she didn't leave until 6:15 when it was time for her to go home.

She didn't leave. Her trainee assistant didn't leave. They both were in that model home sales office the entire day, and that's real world, and that's what really happens when you're a Meritage home salesperson. You can sit if you want and watch the surveillance tape. Her car doesn't move.

She doesn't go get in her car and go show anybody anything. She doesn't go out with a big bag of tools that nobody seems to have. She didn't do any of that. She sat in

that model home sales office because that's a typical day.

That's what they do. That's what this job is about.

And the sad thing is Meritage knew that, but they put that young woman on the stand.

They put that young woman on the stand to support their ridiculous story, and you saw her sitting up there. And at the end of the day, after this HPD former officer, 30-year veteran, fraud investigator has put her under surveillance, called her out, shown her to be completely fabricating her whole story, she had to come back in here. And that young woman that Meritage put on the stand had to sit there and take the Fifth Amendment to try to avoid incriminating herself on a possible penalty of perjury.

That's what Meritage did. That's what they did.

Those are the lengths that they are willing to go to to support a ridiculous, fabricated story. The day that we saw Sunday for Amy Fisher, that is a typical day because this is an inside sales position.

Please don't let Meritage get away with this. Don't let them get away with this. We want you to do what's right. This is an inside sales job, and what they did with Ms. Fisher wasn't right.

It wasn't right. They had their lawyers meet with her, put her up there knowing full well that this is an inside sales job. It was not right.

What they're trying to do to Donna Armstrong, to Tim 1 Gonzalez, to David Lipnicki, it's not right. We're asking you 2 to do what's right. This is an inside sales job. Please tell 3 them that this is an inside sales job. Make them comply with 4 5 the law of how you're supposed to pay inside salespeople. I thank you so much. I thank you for listening to 6 7 this case because this case is so important to these salespeople. I appreciate your time and your attention, and we 8 are very hopeful that you-all are going to do the right thing 9 and not let Meritage get away with this. Thank you. 10 \* \* \* 11 12 (End of requested transcript.) 13 -000-14 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above matter. 15 16 17 Date: July 30, 2015 /s/ Heather Alcaraz 18 Heather Alcaraz, RMR, FCRR 19 Official Court Reporter 2.0 21 22 23 24 25